DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 767 CS 003 539

AUTHOR De Santi, R. J.
TITLE New Considerations of Older Methodologies for Inquiry with Older Readers.
PUB DATE May 77
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (22nd, Miami Beach, Florida, May 2-6, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Methods; *Interviews; *Observation; *Reading Research; *Research Methodology; Research Needs; *Research Problems; Social Science Research

ABSTRACT

Methodological incarceration occurs when research and investigation are restricted by the traditional concepts of how a study should be designed and are hampered by those notions which dictate what research is. This paper examines several reasons why social science research in general--reading research in particular--is considered by some to be irrelevant. Among the topics addressed are the use of variables generated from the situations being studied, the applicability of quantification methods, the intuitive nature of the hypothesis-generation stage, the incorporation of conflicting information into larger theories, and the role of external validity. An alternative methodology, participant observation, is suggested as a strategy to avoid some of these problems. Specifically, the structure of the interview, sampling, questioning techniques, and reliability are discussed as they apply to the participant-observation method. (KS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED141767

New Considerations of Older Methodologies For Inquiry With Older Readers

R. J. DeSanti; School of Education,
Room 342; University of New Orleans;
New Orleans, Louisiana, 70122
(504) 288-3161 Ext 605

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. J. De Santi

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Presented at the Twenty-second Annual
Convention of the International Reading
Association, Miami, May 4, 1977.

CS 003 539

New Considerations of Older Methodologies
For Inquiry With Older Readers

In the recent literature, concerns have been expressed regarding the value of the more traditional empirical methods of pursuing information and answers in the field of reading. Farr and Weintraub (1974-1975) have expressed this concern in their editorial where they state:

> What has brought about a situation in which researchers do not have the tools, techniques, methodologies, and approaches to help them study the problems that are important to the reading field? It seems that it may be the result of methodological incarceration.
>
> Methodological incarceration occurs when research and investigation is restricted by the traditional concepts of how a study should be designed as well as those which dictate what research is. (pp. 549)

Their felt need is further developed and, to an extent answered, when they state:

> We are sorely in need of research designs and new approaches that allow variables to emerge from the situation being studied, that admit to a lack of answers and even to a lack of questions, that allow for study in a natural setting, and that provide for the researcher's biases as well as alternative interpretations. Such inquiry approaches are available in other disciplines. Reading researchers need to identify and explore these alternate methodologies. (pp. 550-551)

In Improving Reading Research (Farr, Weintraub and Tone, 1976), a work subsequent to the above editorial, a first attempt has been made, within the field of reading, to rectify the problems of the traditional methodologies which have been employed. Unfortunately, this volume deals with attempts to modify the classical empirical design:

> Most of the papers in this volume deal with but one type of research - the classical design. This emphasis seems valid because the vast preponderance of research literature has been done and that continues to be produced follows the classical model. The emphasis is upon statistical procedures, and the outline tends to follow relatively well established stages.
>
> Research, however, is - or ought to be - more broadly defined than the classical type model. It seems crucial that we begin to look at other types of research and recognize them as respectable. We would like to suggest the need for going beyond even these recognized - albeit not always 'respectable' - forms. It is time we searched for new models to follow or developed our own.

The latter point, to search for new models to follow or develop our own, is well taken. The former point, to reconsider and revise classical design, is less encouraging. If in fact the classical design is lacking in its ability to facilitate the information which the field of reading requires, then the process of revamping may compound the issue rather than offer an alleviation of the problem.

The classical design has obtained a position of respectability

through traditional acceptance and statistical sophistication. The social sciences, reading included, have long tried to be "scientific" by imitating the physical sciences, physics notwithstanding. It seems, however, that for a very long time we have misunderstood just what it is that makes the physical sciences more of a science than the social sciences. The most superficial property, its apparent preoccupation with numbers and mathematical formulas, has been taken for the one that makes it a science. Large sections of the social sciences have therefore tried to become as mathematical as possible, to count, to quantify its numbers with variables, and to manipulate its new found variables in systems of equations and matrices just as the physicists do. We may have begun by believing that the adopted calculation approaches were merely a convenient shorthand for describing the phenomena with which they deal. However, as ever larger conceptual frameworks are constructed out of the elementary components originally borrowed from other fields, and as these components are named and are manipulated as elements of still more elaborate systems of thought, these frameworks no longer serve as modes of description and become determinants of our viewpoint of the world.

Even the more fundamental concept of the hypothesis, or the null hypothesis which is supposedly more adaptable to statistical inference, a premise of the classical design, is open to question. The hypothesis generation stage is susceptible to intuition and to qualitative statements which can effect the outcomes which are observed. An individual's

decision to adopt a hypothesis involves value judgements and therefore has moral or ethical deimensions. Marc J. Roberts (1974) has written:

> Suppose we must choose between two hypotheses. No matter which we select, there is always the possibility that the other is correct. Obviously the relative likelihood of making a mistake when we select one or the other matters - but so too do the costs of alternative mistakes, the costs of assuming A is true when in fact B is true or visa versa. We might well choose to risk a more likely small cost than a less likely large one. Yet the magnitude of the cost of being wrong in each case cannot be determined except on the basis of our values.
>
> These questions do not arise routinely in scientific work because traditional statistical methods typically subsume them under the choice of test criteria or of the particular technique to be used in estimating some magnitude. That choice is then made on conventional or traditional grounds,usually without discussion, justification, or even acknowledgement that value choices have been made. (pp. 54-55)

The final application of a hypothesis, within a particular study or series of studies, deals with the implications and conclusions. Theoretically, at this point, some statement can be made regarding the hypothesis such as a yea or nay decision or the advocacy of some technique. Through the use of the appropriate methodology some piece of information is rendered which the field in general is to incorporate into its body of knowledge and working principles. We are thus able to

maintain the illusion that we are the decision makers. This position is illusionary because we are confined by a system that permits the asking of only certain types of questions, that accepts only certain types of data, and which is presently being considered as a inappropriate means.

The generation of hypotheses, and the testing and reporting of them, is intended to render information which can be accepted within certain confines of external validity or generalizability. And applied to a growing body of knowledge which is to be considered as "fact." These facts are then rendered into a set of theories and models which are to explain and guide the production of future knowledge. An element of this procedure, which should generate unrest and concern within a area of inquiry, is that of the countering hypothesis. A countering hypothesis is one which presents information which is contrary to popularly held theories. This element is, however, accounted for through the use of a circuital form of logic which is described by Weizenbaum (1976):

> It is not even true, again contrary to common belief, that a single purported counter-instance that, if accepted as genuine would certainly falsify a specific scientific theory, generally leads to the immediate abandonment of that theory. Probably all scientific theories currently accepted by scientists themselves (excepting only those purely formal theories claiming no relation to the empirical world) are today confronted with

> contradicting evidence of more than negligible weight that, again if fully credited, would logically invalidate them. Such evidence is often explained (that is, explained away) by ascribing it to error of some kind, say, observational error, or by characterizing it as inessential, or by the assumption (that is, the faith) that some yet-to-be-discovered way of dealing with it will some day permit it to be acknowledged but nevertheless incorporated into the scientific theories it was originally thought to contradict. In this way scientists continue to rely on already impaired theories and to infer 'scientific fact' from them. (paranthetical remarks by Weizenbaum, pp. 15)

It is encouraging to note that the present concerns with classical dessign and empirical methodologies are apparently attempting to deal with this underlying belief which until recently was taken for granted by large numbers of people who were involved with research. This belief is succinctly expressed by Weizenbaum (1976) when he notes:

> Scientists, with some exceptions, share the same faith; what science has not done, it has not <u>yet</u> done; the questions science has not answered, it has not <u>yet</u> answered. (emphasis stressed by Weizenbaum, pp. 126)

This belief stems from the notion that science can account for nature and the events which occur within nature; that through exclusively scientific terms man and his environment and behavior can be tallied up and accounted for. Polany (1964) exhibits how these scientific be-

liefs have been protected through thought patterns which are indigenous to science itself:

> Any contradiction between a particular scientific notion and the facts of experience will be explained by other scientific notions; there is a ready preserve of possible hypotheses available to explain any conceivable event. . . . within science itself, the stability of theories against experience is maintained by epicyclical reserves which suppress alternative conceptions in the germ. (pp. 292)

The final concern of the use of hypotheses which will be considered here is that of generalizability or what Campbell and Stanley (1966) have termed external validity. External validity deals with how far one can generalize one's findings, or in other words, to what groups of persons or situations other than those under consideration may the results obtained be applicable. This question is of considerable importance because researchers in the behavioral sciences have recognized that much of their research has been conducted with available groups and in contrived situations. Wardrop (1976) has considered this question and offers an answer:

> 'How far can I generalize my results?' is one of the most frequent concerns of a researcher. The 'proper' answer is disheartening: to only that population whose members had a chance to be included in the sample from which you obtained your data, and only under the same conditions. (pp. 27)

Wardrop's comment is a by-product of the very objectivity, if we exclude the ethical or moral dimensions which Roberts presented, which has been employed in empirical research. In general classical research as employed in the social sciences is now being considered by some as being inappropriate for at least the following reasons:

1. Methodological incarceration, or the generally overriding constraints and restrictions which have been imposed through traditional approaches

2. The present approaches do not permit variables to arise from within the situations being studied

3. The questionable applicability of quantification methods to the study of human behaviors and the use of these methods as the foundations of larger more complicated methods

4. The ignorance of the fact that the hypothesis generation stage is susceptible to intuition and qualitative statements

5. The answer which a method is capable of generating is limited by the questions which are permissible

6. Conflicting pieces of information are subsumed under larger theories or explanations without resolving the differences

7. External validity, the intrinsic value of empirical research and inferrential statistics, is so severely limited as to place in doubt the applicability of the information rendered

8. Attempts to patch up or revise present methodologies would lead to an interesting version of what economists call the non-satiation

principle: if something is good, more is better.

If the foregoing statement, number eight above, is accepted then these methodologies cannot be accepted as inherently good. Precautions should be taken against a rationalization which would lead to attempts to revise present methodologies. Reasoning which posited that to an extent the implements of the classical design have helped to delineate areas of inquiry and to supply some answers and that, if revised or reworked, they can be applicable, would not be profitable. In a paraphrase of Weizenbaum (1976), if we accepted that the approach is helpful and powerful and is cramped by some limitations which are perceived to be minor, then the researcher is lead to put effort into the removal of the limitations. Intensive and time consuming "research" is expended in attempting to alleviate the limitations. Such a process usually generates subproblems which increasingly dominate the task and can eventually become the center of attention.

> As ever more investment is made in attacking these initially ancillary subproblems, and as progress is made in cracking them, an illusion tends to grow that real work is being done on the main problem. The poverty of the technique, if it is indeed impotent to deal with its presumed subject matter, is thus hidden behind a mountain of effort, much of which may well be successful in its own terms. But these are terms in a constructed context that has no substantive overlap with, or even relationship to, the context determined by the problems to which the original

> technique is to be applied. The collection of subproblems together with the lore, jargon, and subtechniques which crystalized around them, becomes reified. The larger this collection is, and the more human energy has been invested in its creation, the more real it seems. And the harder the subproblems were to solve and the more technical success was gained in solving them, the more is the original technique fortified. (pp. 36)

With the number of problems expressed which concern themselves with the classical design and empirical research, and which indicate that we can count, but we are rapidly forgetting how to say what is worth counting and why, we are led to a need for the exploration, identification, development and implementation of alternate methodologies.

ALTERNATE METHODOLOGIES

Two excerpts from Wardrop (1976) and one from Goodman (1976) will set the stage for the presentation of alternate methodologies.

> (There is) a distinction between exploratory and confirmatory research. In the former, one adopts a stance of 'ignorance' about some phenomenon and designs a study which will hopefully reduce the level of ignorance and even suggest questions for further study in confirmatory research. (Wardrop, pp. 23)

> One of the external-validity problems not given sufficient attention is what Egon Brunswick called 'ecological validity.' In brief, if we seek theories and procedures to use in natural set-

> tings, we must ultimately turn to those natural settings for validating our theories and procedures. (Wardrop, pp. 30)

> Research studies of large numbers of subjects must give way to in-depth studies of small numbers, such as those popular in linguistics and developmental psycholinguistics. If a researcher can find through the study of a single subject how reading is used to comprehend a writer's message, an important contribution will be made to human knowledge.
>
> Real problems using real language in various situations must be the objects of research if we are to understand reading as it really is. Research problems are being generated today from a variety of productive sources. (Goodman, pp. 98)

The Role of Participant Observation.

The following discussion presents an approach to exploratory research and ecological validity. The results of an initial employment of this approach are reported by DeSanti (1976) where he discusses the reading strategies, habits and interests of mature sophisticated readers who are sixty years of age or older.

Participant observation, a form of which is known as interviewing, is a method of data collection which lends itself to the process of analytic induction as a research procedure. Cressey (1950) and Robinson (1951) have presented very intelligible statements of analytic induction as a research procedure, as follows:

(1) A rough definition of the phenomenon to be explained is formulated. (2) An hypothetical explanation of that phenomenon is formulated. (3) One case is studied in the light of the hypothesis with the object of determining whether the hypothesis fits the facts in that case. (4) If the hypothesis does not fit the facts, either the hypothesis is reformulated or the phenomenon to be explained is re-defined, so that the case is excluded. (5) Practical certainty may be attained after a small number of cases have been examined, but the discovery by the investigator or any other investigator of a single negative case disproves the explanation and requires a re-formation. (6) This procedure of examining cases, re-defining the phenomenon and re-formulating the hypothesis is continued until a universal relationship is established, each negative case calling for redefinition or a re-formulation.

The interview method lends itself to analytic induction in that it offers the opportunity for revisions when they are deemed necessary. Good, Barr and Scates (1935) have listed a number of advantages in favor of employing the interview technique:

(1) Interviewing allows the interviewer to follow-up leads and take advantage of small leads or clues. (2) Interviewing allows the interviewer to gain an impression of the person giving the facts and to form some judgement of the truth in the statements and to 'read between the lines.' (3) People generally do not

> care to put confidential information in writing, they may want to see who is getting the information and receive guarantees as to how it will be used. (4) Some persons need the stimulation of personal contacts in order to be 'drawn out.' (5) A number of people may be too ignorant to read and write. (6) The interview session gives the interviewer an opportunity to give information and to develop certain attitudes on the part of the person being interviewed. (pp. 378)

The Structure of the Interview.

Rich (1968) has outlined five types of interviews:

(1) Fact finding - to elicit facts.

(2) Fact giving - the interviewer decides which facts he will give to the other person.

(3) Manipulative - to bring about a predetermined change. This method frequently involves various impositions.

(4) Treatment - this method is also intended to bring about change, but not through the process of imposition. The strategies employed are rather of the nature of supportive counseling, insight giving, reciprocal inhibition and hypnosis.

(5) Demonstrative - as in a situation where one engages the performance of a child in a clinical setting.

In the present situation the first three types of interviews (fact finding, fact giving, and manipulative) are discussed. It is apparent

that all three types of interaction can be expected to occur in the same interview session and that both the interviewer and the respondent would, at various times, be in each of these positions. It is natural to assume that the respondent would briefly switch roles with the interviewer when questions regarding the interviewer's auspices, sponsors and other identifying information are sought. At this period, when the respondent is acting as the fact finder, the interviewer is performing the role of fact giver. On the other hand, the interviewer is the fact finder and the respondent is the fact giver for the major portion of the interview where information is being sought regarding a particular concern such as an older person's reading habits, interests and needs.

The third type of interview, manipulation, is likely to occur at the beginning of an interview session when the interviewer is attempting to gain the respondent's confidence and to guide the converstaion towards the topics about which information is being sought.

The tone which the interviewer sets during the phases where he acts as manipulator and fact giver is important to the overall outcome of the interview. A variety of approaches (Leznoff 1956, Paul 1953) have been suggested to help gain acceptance of the interviewer in his role. Those which are most pertinent are: (1) that the interviewer is writing a book, or research project, and (2) that the interviewer is simply trying to understand the older person's way of life on its own merits.

Rogers (1942) sums up the requirements for a good interviewing re-

lationship as follows: (1) warmth and responsiveness, (2) permissiveness with regard to expression of feelings, and (3) freedom from pressure of coercion. In other words, the older person must think of the interviewer and himself as "we" rather than as "you and I." The formation of rapport is a prerequisite for anything other than the most superficial work.

Sampling.

Unlike the procedures in many other types of research, sampling in participant observation studies is not designed and executed in advance of data collection but is continually carried on throughout the study. For example, a sample is drawn, of variables, indicators or older persons. The study of these typically gives rise to further ideas, questions, or hypotheses on the part of the observer, and these then lead him to draw still further samples of different sorts in order to pursue the emerging ideas. As a consequence, those who employ participant observations can seldom prescribe their sample in advance but can only describe and justify them after the fact (McCall & Simmons 1969).

There are at least three general types of sampling procedures which the observer can indicate that he will employ. The first of these is some sort of quota sample, in which, for example, the observer is aware of certain formal categories of organization members and he determines beforehand that he will interview and observe at least a few persons from each of these categories (Chein 1959).

A second type of sampling procedure often employed in participant observation is the amplification sample technique, in which, for example, choosing one informant generates information about other persons which leads the observer to contact one of these others as a second informant, who in turn directs him to a third, etc., in an extensive chain of contacts (Coleman 1958).

A third type, employed when empirical relationships have been hypothesized between categories of persons, events, or variables, is the search for exceptions to such relationships.

None of the above procedures are restricted to any particular type of content, nor are they the only sampling procedures which may be employed. Random sampling techniques, for instance, with all their attendant advantages, and disadvantages, may sometimes be applicable. Generally speaking, however, vagaries of an observer's access to information and the reporting abilities of subjects make it highly unlikely that every element in the sampled population will have the same likelihood of contributing to the study. Therefore, sampling procedures such as those mentioned above appear to be most appropriate.

Kahn (1957) and Richardson, Dohrenwend and Klein (1965) have noted that if one is not seeking information on external events by treating the interviewee as an indirect or "deputized" observer, the interview process takes the form of respondent interviewing, especially where the information sought concerns the personal feelings, perceptions, motives, habits, or intentions of the interviewee. In such situations, it is the person rather than the event that is of interest to the researcher.

When persons are the focus, it is usually because of variability in phenomena rather than institutionalized sameness, that differences are observed.

Questioning Techniques.

The design of an interview, as indicated above, is substantially determined by the objectives of the interview. Data are primarily collected by asking questions which are predetermined and/or spontaneous. Piaget (1929) expressed his belief that there is a medial area where the distinction between these two types of questions is not definite.

> *. . . it is so hard to find the middle course between systematization due to preconceived ideas and incoherence due to the absence of any directing hypothesis! The good experimenter must, in fact unite two often incompatible qualities; he must know how to observe, that is to say, to let the child talk freely, without ever checking or sidetracking his utterance, and at the same time he must constantly be alert for something definite; at every moment he must have some working hypothesis, some theory, true or false, which he is seeking to check. (pp.8)

Questions generally take the form of being either highly structured or unstructured. Highly structured questions are generally called

---

*Although Piaget was referring to his work with children, his statement seems equally applicable to work with older people. I believe that it is not harmful, but rather advantageous, to read the word "person" where "child" appears.

"closed" questions and require a minimum answer, such as "yes" or "no." An example of which would be, "How old are you?" Unstructured questions, sometimes called "open-ended," allow for a variety of responses, but tend to present problems to the researcher as he attempts to summarize diffuse responses into standardized categories amenable to tabulation or analysis. Ebel (1969) offers a more in-depth explanation of these differences and the ramifications of their selection.

Rich (1968) classifies both closed and open-ended questions as being direct questions because by their nature the respondent is aware, more or less, of what is being asked of him. Rich also indicates that indirect and leading questions may be employed. He suggests that the topic covered by an indirect question should be repeated after a short period of time so as not to be obvious and to gain a check on the information which has been rendered. The leading question suggests the answer, such as the question, "You don't read do you?" The researcher is cautioned that errors of assessment may occur when questions of a direct or closed nature are used, because if the interviewer is off base the respondent has no chance to explain. On the other hand the open question may allow the respondent to avoid the point altogether.

Much of the initial questioning consists of reportorial, closed type questions which seek to identify the individual older person's demographic characteristics - the who, what, where, when and why of events. During the main body of the interview, where information is being sought about reading habits, interests and needs, question types may be intermingled.

A final group of question types, which may be employed only when a given situation lends itself to their use, has been outlined by Strauss, Schatzman, Bucher, Ehrlich and Sabshin (1964). In the later states of their research they adopted a posing type of question, which involved putting forth a hypothetical situation to the respondent. They list the following types of posing questions. (1) The challenge, or "devil's-advocate" question, allows the field worker to deliberately confront the respondent with arguments of opponents. The intention is to elicit assertion and to therefore round out the respondent's position by forcing him to respond to a challenge. (2) The hypothetical question is also intended to round out the respondent's thought structure but without accompanying rhetorical heat. Generally the field worker poses a number of possible occurrences and the respondent's comments and observations are recorded. (3) The third type of question is called posing the ideal and exists in two forms. First, the respondent can be asked to describe the ideal situation, such as the ideal method of obtaining reading materials. Second, while the field worker can still pretend to be somewhat naive, he can assert an ideal to see what response is elicited. (4) Offering interpretations or testing propositions on the respondent is a final method of questioning. It is sometimes very useful to tell respondents about the propositions that one is beginning to pull together about events interesting to them. If they disagree, they will usually volunteer information to counter a proposition, which may lead the field worker into further unanticipate search. If they agree, the tendency is to qualify the proposition.

Keeping in mind Piaget's admonition regarding being both flexible and having preconceived ideas for the interview session, a number of questions can be generated before hand. Questions may be generated as newly created items or as adaptions of questions used by others. In adapting the questions of previous studies Edwards' (1957) guidelines for rewording questions to other groups can be useful. The components of Edwards' guidelines are as follows:

1. Avoid statements referring to past rather than present.
2. Avoid factual statements.
3. Avoid ambiguity.
4. Avoid statements irrelevant to the psychological object under consideration.
5. Avoid statements likely to be endorsed by almost anyone or no one.
6. Select statements believed to cover the entire range of affective interest.
7. Use simple, clear, direct language.
8. Make statements short -- twenty words.
9. Each statement should have only one complete thought.
10. Avoid all, always, none, and never -- they are ambiguous.
11. Use of words like only, just, or merely is to be avoided.
12. Use simple sentences.
13. Avoid the use of words which may be incomprehensible to the group.
14. Avoid the use of double negatives.

Reliability.

The research worker must be alert to detect distortion wherever it occurs. Dean and Whyte (1958) offer four checks to evaluate the quality of information obtained. (1) First, there is the important negative check of implausibility. If an account strongly strains our credulity and just does not seem at all plausible, then we are justified in suspecting distortion. (2) Also an aid in detecting distortion is any knowledge we have of the unreliability of the informant as an accurate reporter. (3) Our knowledge of an informant's mental set and an understanding of how it might influence his perception and interpretation of events is another aid in detecting distortion. (4) The final aid is to compare an informant's account with the accounts given by others.

Interjudge reliability can be facilitated through the availability of accurate records of the interview sessions. Among the variety of methods available for the recording of data (notetaking, during or after the interview session, video tape, audio tape) audio tape appears to be the most beneficial and practical. Audio taping allows for a record of all of the conversation which transacts and demands a minimum of distraction. Notetaking during an interview would require the interviewer to divide his attention and might govern the flow of information because of the respondent's concern of speaking beyond the interviewer's notetaking ability. Notetaking after an interview would be dependent on the interviewer's memory and would not be as accurate or dependable a method of record keeping as audio tape. Video tape, with its attendant equipment and logistic requirements, is frequently impractical.

It has been suggested elsewhere that the use of taping equipment does not introduce an inhibiting factor after its initial acceptance. Provided the interviewer matter-of-factly introduces the tape recorder and expresses his concern for an accurate record, the manipulative part of the interview should lead to a lack of concern regarding the presence of the taping equipment.

The storage of the interview data must be systematic. McCall (1969) and Simmons offer a system which is predicated upon the fact that indexing and data analysis facilitate each other. In this system, each interview is typed upon mimeograph stencils and multiple copies are run off and filed in labeled folders, each of which pertains to a single topic, category or variable. The verbal material pertinent to the subject matter of a given folder is circled in red and only those pages which contain circled material are inserted in that folder. A complete copy of the interview is placed in chronological order in a cumulative file folder which then serves the purpose of an ordinary field diary. The stencils and a few extra copies are labled and filed separately in chronological order so that, should further categories emerge later in the study, pertinent pages of field notes from the past can be added to new files.

Because of the non-standardized way the data are collected in participant observations, they are generally not useful for statistical treatment. This means that quantitative relationships usually cannot be established and the researcher has to depend on a more impressionistic interpretation of the data for arriving at generalizations. Field inquiries,

using unstructured methods, will often suggest hypotheses to be tested, but seldom provide data for testing them (Dean,Eichhorn & Dean 1967). As a result, the data collected in such studies must be reported through the use of descriptive statistics which lends itself to the effective organization and communication of data rather than the use of inferential statistics which are intended to generate conclusions extending beyond the immediate data. The use of descriptive statistics allows for the organization of data and permits summary statements about the average level of the magnitude of the information involved.

REFERENCES

Campbell, D.T., & Stanley, J. C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1966.

Chein, I. An introduction to sampling. In C. Selltiz, M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch and S.W. Cook (Eds.), Research methods in social relations. New York: Holt, 1959.

Coleman, J. S. Relational analysis: The study of social organizations with survey methods. Human Organization, 1958, 17, 28-36.

Cressey, L. Criminal violations of financial trust. American Sociological Review, 1950, 15, 738-743.

Dean, J. P., Eichhorn, R. L., & Dean, L. R. Limitations and advantages of unstructured methods. In J. T. Doby (Ed.), An introduction to social research. New York: Meredith Publishing Co., 1967.

Dean, J. P., & Whyte, W. F. How do you know if the informant is telling the truth? Human Organization, 1958, 17, 34-38.

DeSanti, R.J. The reading habits and interests of persons sixty years of age and older. Paper presented at National Reading Conference 26th Annual Convention, Atlanta, 1976.

Ebel, R. L. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of educational research (4th ed.). Toronto: Macmillan, 1969.

Edwards, A. L. Techniques of attitude scale construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Farr, R., & Weintraub, S. Editorial: Methodological incarceration. Reading Research Quarterly, 1974-75, 10, 549-552.

Farr, R., Weintraub, S., & Tone, B. (Eds.). Improving reading research. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1976.

Good, C. V., Barr, A. S., & Scates, D. E. The methodology of educational research. New York: Appleton-Century, 1935.

Goodman, K.S. Linguistically sound research in reading. In Farr, R., Weintraub, S. and Tone, B. (Eds.), Improving reading research. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1976.

Kahn, R. L., & Cannell, C. F. The dynamics of interviewing. New York: Wiley, 1957.

Leznoff, M. Interviewing homosexuals. American Journal of Sociology, 1956, 62, 202-204.

McCall, G. L., & Simmons, J. L. (Eds.). Issues in participant observation: A Text and reader. Reding, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Paul, B. Interview techniques and field relationships. In A. L. Kroeber (Ed.), Anthropology today. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1953.

Piaget, J. The child's conception of the world. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1929.

Polanyi, M. Personal Knowledge. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964.

Rich, J. Interviewing children and adolescents. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1968.

Richardson, S. A., Dohrenwend, B. S. & Klein, D. Interviewing: Its forms and functions. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Roberts, M. J. Nature and condition of social science. Daedalus, Summer, 1974.

Robinson, W. S. The logical structure of analytic induction. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 812-818.

Rogers, C. R. Counselling and psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1942.

Strauss, A., Schatzman, L., Buchner, R., Ehrlich, D., & Sabshin, M. Psychiatric ideologies and instruction. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Wardrop, J. L. Design problems in reading research. In Farr, R., Weintraub, S. & Tone, B. (Eds.), Improving reading research. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1976.

Weizenbaum, J. Computer power and human reason: From judgement to calculation. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1976.

summary page + handout

NEW CONSIDERATIONS OF OLDER METHODOLOGIES FOR INQUIRY WITH OLDER READERS

R. J. DE SANTI, UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS, I.R.A. MIAMI, 1977.

1. Methodological incarceration, or the generally overriding constraints and restrictions which have been imposed through traditional approaches.

2. The present approaches do not permit variables to arise from within the situations being studied.

3. The questionable applicability of quantification methods to the study of human behaviors and the use of these methods as the foundations of larger more complicated methods.

4. The ignorance of the fact that the hypothesis generation stage is susceptible to intuition and qualitative statements.

5. The answer which a method is capable of generating is limited by the questions which are permissible.

6. Conflicting pieces of information are subsumed under larger theories or explanations without resolving the differences.

7. External validity, the intrinsic value of empirical research and inferential statistics, is so severly limited as to place in doubt the applicability of the information rendered.

8. Attempts to patch up or revise present methodologies would lead to an interesting version of what economists call the non-satiation principle: if something is good, more is better.

1. Exploratory research to reduce "ignorance" and suggest questions.

2. Employ "ecological validity" or turn to natural settings for validating our theories and procedures.

3. Studies of large numbers should give way to in-depth studies of small numbers.

4. Real problems using real language in various settings must be the objects of research.

5. Participant observation in the form of interviewing as a method of analytic induction.

6. Advantages of interviewing: permits follow-up, facilitates judgements.

7. Structuring the interview: fact finding, fact giving, manipulation, treatment and demonstration.

8. Sampling procedures: quotas, amplification and searching for exceptions to relationships.

9. Questioning techniques:

highly structured (closed)
unstructured (open)

direct
indirect
leading
posing

- challenge
- hypothetical
- ideal situations
- offering interpretations

10. Interjudge reliability and record keeping.